

19. Comments on SCAN.

1. SCAN has a place in the modern Weather Service, however it should be used only as a monitoring program, and not as the sole basis for warning decisions. I would be more pleased with SCAN if the processor overhead was less of an impact on the workstations.
2. SCAN is not a very useful piece of software. The information it contains is old (in terms of volume scans) and does not contain any additional NEW information which can not be obtained through careful analysis of the various radar products. I believe it is used by forecasters in non-severe weather offices as a handicap. FFMP part of SCAN however does show promise.
3. Need more detailed documentation AND training on how each parameter is calculated.
4. Suffers from deficiency of all volume products - not seen til the end of a scan. Base data is far more important in making good warning decisions. Our forecast area is relatively small, and thus the main advantage of SCAN - automatically monitoring more storms than a human being can - is minimized. In all honesty, for our office, I do not view SCAN as being a good use of increasingly precious AWIPS CPU cycles.
5. Fix the system resource management issue. SCAN still crashes.
6. Personal use of SCAN has been very very limited.
7. While SCAN may have loads of useful information the experience is that it bogs the system down too much. AWIPS is slow enough..on the Hp side...that the extra burden is more than most folks want to put up with. Some feel there may be too much information floating around. Too much clutter on a display, while potentially valuable information may be there, makes for too much confusion. I think the main hangup however is the taxing of the system.
8. scan produces so many false alarms (usually when there is clear weather) at LOX that is all but useless.
9. We don't use it here because it was too "noisy" both in terms of alarms and products that were displayed.
10. SCAN is good as safety net to detect things that might slip by otherwise, which I believe is what the designers intended.
11. Although the output is pleasing to the eye and well organized, I don't believe it provides enough added value over other data sources that I feel I need to use it yet.
12. The algorithms and displays are useful. However, SCAN is a resource hog, a screen bully, and the time it takes to view data is too long to make it fully useful in the warning process. There isn't enough time during a volume scan to view the SCAN output at current speed. How to fix this? More efficient programming. DON'T have SCAN pop up its menu bar every time new data comes in. Make it smaller. Have output available sooner.
13. Strains system resources during extremely critical operations.
14. This program is too slow for real-time information. Needs to have an overhaul on speed (computer upgrades need to handle memory). Otherwise good information but too time consuming.

15. SCAN and Warngen cannot be run simultaneously on one workstation. This limitation causes SCAN to take a back seat, since Warngen is a must have, where as SCAN is primarily a nice to have.
16. I have used SCAN on a consistent basis for the past two years. It has helped that the AWIPS workstation can now handle the load better during a severe weather event.
17. The greatest value of scan to me is first cell detection, especially in clutter. We're rcvg far too many false alarms on meso's (winter). Some of this must be local requirements driven. We dont need scan alarming all awips wstns... just one workstn will be fine and not both D2D's, tho am aware a fix is in the works for the double D2D banner problem.
18. Way way too computer resource intensive. When first got it, we tried it out. It so delayed critical radar data, that we never used it again. Just not worth it. the idea is great, but need a computer that can handle it. A the present awips can not. Every build slows it down just a little more. It is too slow now, scan just another load on the broken donkey.
19. It's a system hog for aging HP hardware. Perhaps when we upgrade the workstations and servers to linux, this application could take on new life.
20. This system seems to be going in the right direction. Although, I normally do not use it as warning coordinator, as I feel the other means of analyzing storm structure for severe potential much more reliable...given the algorithm information provided. I will usually ensure it is running on a least one workstation during convection for a general overview of storms and storm structure.
21. Please continue to optimize SCAN to minimize its use of AWIPS resources.
22. comprehensive and easy to use. slow on awips, sometimes seizes up.
23. It needs to be more user configurable, and on each separate workstation. It also needs to be easier to exit the application, without clearing the entire screen. SCAN also slows a workstation down so much that it can be awkward to use.
24. Only formal SCAN training I can remember was during a teletraining session for a software upgrade when the current version was first introduced. I haven't see a lot of people in our office using it, due to lag time between 88D products indicating a signature (e.g. red banners for VIL, TVS, etc. vs SCAN indicating it).
25. SCAN is rarely incorporated into our operations during severe weather. Although the forecasters have received training on the application, most find the information it depicts to be "late" and of little use in the warning process. However, I believe additional training could help forecasters better utilize the application, and plan to conduct such training (focusing on the use of SCAN as a decision assistance and "big picture" monitoring tool). Although, any use of SCAN by forecasters will ultimately be dependent upon the performance (speed) of SCAN, and its impact on the workstation (this has been the biggest problem with the utilization of SCAN on AWIPS since its inception).
26. Seems to be working better than before
27. It needs to work faster! It is way too slow on the regular workstation!
28. Runs too slowly (especially on the HP workstations), and have had problems with it failing to update in a timely manner in the past.

29. It is nice when you have a few cells on radar, but when widespread convection is occurring, I find scan very difficult to use. why do we have this annoying loud sound everytime a new cell is identified? Can't it be disabled? It is horrible.
30. In the age of data overload, SCAN complicates matters. If it is a busy severe weather event and there is only one radar operator, their time is absorbed by interpreting the radar data and issuing warnings, follow statements, etc. Half the time scan sets off an audible alarm and you have to spend time trying to figure out what it is alarming for. Maybe these concerns are settings or a lack of training on the local level?
31. 1) It slows down workstation performance and the information is older than the displayed volume scans. The busier the radar, the slower scan is. 2) I had experience where it had two separate lines of data listed for the same cell 3) I had experience where it had max vil listed on the wrong line, ie for the wrong cell... therefore, I do not use SCAN and have not for nearly two convective seasons. There may be in the future software that enhances my ability to monitor convection, and I look forward to using it. SCAN in its present form does not fill that need.
32. The AWIPS info list is not the way the NWS should be passing out information. We need a list just from the experts at MDL rather than all the complaining from each office around the country.
33. Our management strongly discourages its use at DVN, although it is "engaged" and will buzz us when criteria are met.
34. VERY USEFUL APPLICATION...WOULD BE NICE IF IT WERE MERGED WITH WARNGEN
35. I like the cell trend feature on SCAN which is very helpful during pulse severe events. I don't use much of the other features.
36. SCAN drags down the resources of the work station to the point that we are unable to run it on the warning stations effectively, and suffer significant degradation in operations.
37. SCAN slows the system down too much, and it's benefits do not outweigh the costs of slowing AWIPS down.
38. It is great on the Linux machines but woefully slow on the HPs. It is most useful as a summary/quick look tool. It does NOT substitute for thorough diagnosis of the actual radar returns.
39. Unfortunately, the few times SCAN has been used, it tends to get in the way- there's almost too much information. It's just one more thing to look at when eyes should be on the base data. Also, we have found that it slows down the computers some, but since last spring there have been hardware upgrades, and it may be more easily handled then. It's appearance of helpfulness is not helped when it tells us there's a thunderstorm in a bunch of stratiform snow.
40. It is just too slow to be of much use. Our severe weather is short lived, and delays of 5 to 10 minutes will mean that in many cases you will be too late with a warning.
41. Program usually locks up the D2D. This is not really a good thing, especially when you are in the middle of a severe weather event.
42. I never use it. It fails so much that it is now just ignored. Needs to be much more robust to be an operationally useful monitoring tool.

43. Scan works fine. I wish that it could be integrated more with the radar products similar to WDSS. The timeliness needs to be improved, hopefully the processor upgrades in the future will help.
44. I have found SCAN to be useful, however, it consumes a high percentage of CPU usage when involved...enough to slow down the PC to an unexceptable level when needed most.
45. By incorporating computer algorithms, SCAN promotes poor radar interrogation on the part of the human. A human/machine mix is still desirable, I/we simply feel SCAN pushes the mix too far toward the machine.
46. SCAN provides a nice summary of the storms on the radar, but I rarely use it for warning decision.
47. SCAN bogs down the HP workstations so badly they become practically useless. Waiting for alerts from SCAN delays looking at critical radar data. By the time SCAN alerts, you've probably missed the severe weather. I have not found it useful for warning operations.
48. I haven't found it to be very useful. It tends to alert you to things after you already know about them.
49. SCAN is useful but slow. I do not receive the SCAN output until a few minutes after the volume scan. Considering the time it takes for volume scan any delay after is tough. I sometimes do not use SCAN because of the time delay. It would be nice to have the parameters of SCAN that could be updated before the volume scan is complete to update. IE, a TVS is recognized.
50. Need more training.
51. Works OK, but it does take a lot of resources to display. Often, when workstations slow down during severe weather, SCAN is the first application to get killed.
52. Very useful but critical timing bugs (see below)until Build 5.2.2
53. I use the SCAN program to monitor thunderstorm activity while I am busy forecasting. It is most helpful as a monitoring tool rather than being used for an active severe weather event where I am making warning decisions.
54. Just signed up on the SCAN info list.
55. SCAN has good information, but the user interface still has numerous stupid implementations, and performance (speed, responsiveness, etc.) sometimes is not acceptable. We often have to be very careful with how many people are using SCAN at the same time, how long it has been running, etc. - or, otherwise, we will experience problems. This is just plain stupid design. WFOs have 4 or 5 workstations because sometimes they need 4 or 5 working on an event. Software should be designed to work within reason during the demands of real events and real loads.
56. I don't use SCAN because it bogs the whole system down, is too complex, annoying and loud. When severe weather is moving in or occurring the last thing I need is a bunch of flashy, loud and annoying bells and whistles going off. For me, all it does is distract from the simple, clear and useful radar information already available on AWIPS. If it were up to me, I'd turn it off completely.
57. Too many alarms for irrelevant parameters.
58. I rarely use scan due to the previous track record of the program causing computer problems.

59. have not found this application to be useful yet in operations
60. A little slow and limits your d2d performance. Needs to be optimized or hardware upgraded to support program resource requirements.
61. Trend graphics are by far the most useful aspect of SCAN. However, rarely do we have situations where volume-based products are helpful in a warning situation. This is when there are so many storms in the CWA that the warning forecasters can carefully monitor each one. Perhaps in the days of the PUP volume products were more important, but with AWIPS capabilities such as All Tilts, 4-panels with Refl/SRM combined, and easy X-section creation, almost 100% of our warnings are based on analysis of the base data, and onyl rarely do volume products draw our attention to storms we would have otherwise missed. Overall, we do not use SCAN very much, although we typically have it running.
62. I understand that SCAN needs a full Volume Scan to updated its information, but it can be a bit slow, compared to the other Radar products already available through D2D. It can also clutter up the screen. Also, the alarm that SCAN has detected another cell is quite annoying, often we already are aware of the radar pattern.
63. I like SCAN...however, a faster processor to run the SCAN application on would be a big improvement. The information that SCAN displays is usually between 6 and 8 minutes old when our 88D is in VCP11. This is too slow to be of much use except in situations where looking at base data is either impractical or impossible.
64. Haven't been trained, nor do we use SCAN yet here at ILN.
65. Data in scan are typically older than data available on the AWIPS radar pull-down menus. If I am monitoring radar during severe weather, I already have interrogated all SCAN aspects of the storm before they update in the table. I don't like that I can't re-size to window to fit my display. SCAN is useful when monitoring is casual due to weak convection.
66. More training should be done on how use use SCAN most effectively.
67. I basically just use scan to alert me to the most important storms...ones needing my attention. Although, being January, it has been a while since I used it. It is clunky so I do not rely on it very much.
68. Slows the system down too much. Unless alarms are extensively configured, system alarms nearly continuously.
69. SCAN has a way to go to mimick WDSS
70. Performance, performance, performance. SCAN takes up significant system resources, and slows down the workstation and the DS. With access to WDSS II, I choose not to use SCAN. SCAN takes the forecaster out of the warning process on some level. If one were to take the time to open the individual windows for the various algorithm variable output, there would be no time to look at actual data. The ability to efficiently produce cross sections such as is possible with WDSS II, would help to make scan a much more useful tool.
71. The lag time between the end of a volume scan and when SCAN tables are updated in the GUI renders SCAN nearly useless in an active warning situation. In fact, SCAN is almost detrimental in that it slows down the workstation in those situations. In its defense, SCAN can still be useful in a monitoring situation when convection is beginning to develop or is strengthening initially to a severe

level.

72. I like this application. It is relatively easy to master and provides relevant information in convenient forms and graphics.
73. A very easy way to keep an organized view of the status and more importantly the trends of convective cells in radar range.
74. In severe weather situations the SCAN application often overloads our AWIPS. The GUI does not respond quickly enough to be of practical use.
75. I (we) have not started using this program yet...although we get scan alerts.
76. SCAN is a pretty good tool to use to help weed through complicated radar data during potential severe weather. Using SCAN properly can reduce the amount of time that it takes to focus on the really strong storms, which should translate into improved lead time for warnings. There is the feeling by some of my fellow staff members that using SCAN only reduces the amount of AWIPS CPU resources that you have available for other things, which is true...but that's a problem in general with AWIPS that needs to be solved (AWIPS is way too slow for what we're trying to do with it).
77. Needs a lot of processor power (especially on HP AWIPS workstations). Works great on Linux machines.
78. Easy to manipulate.
79. Generally slows down the system too much to use regularly. Has some effective uses but can slow the system down too much at times.
80. it does slow down AWIPS.
81. SCAN is not needed. I know of very few forecasters that use it at all. Similar or the same products can be called up by other means (plus it slows down the workstations).
82. It runs too slow on AWIPS. It takes lots of extra resources slowing other applications significantly.
83. The time delay on getting information from scan renders the program useless as I have already made the warning decision based on the suite of 88d products on awips along with the combined attribute table. The endless messages from scan that show up on the D2D screens are not timely and are in fact a hindrance to me while trying to examine products quickly to make warning decisions. An easy option to turn off the scan messages should be available. Also, SCAN brings the workstation down to a crawl.
84. Uses too much resources, and slows down AWIPS processing of other tasks. AWIPS sometimes crashes due to ineffective resource allocation. Learning from written manuals is not an efficient or effective way to train on the use of so many fields.
85. We hardly use it here, mainly because we don't have much convective weather. When we have used it, it hasn't added very much to what we already had (storm tracking index, hail detection, etc). I don't like the fact that in order to remove SCAN from the display, I have to clear the whole display and start

over. It would be much more efficient to just unload SCAN rather than clearing the display.

86. The beeping sounds are annoying of new cells within the area. if another person is using SCAN and turns off the beeping sounds then it automatically turns on the other persons
87. Important/critical information on SCAN is disseminated by me, as our office radar focal point, to our staff after coordinating with our AWIPS focal point and IT, and usually consists of local configuration information. This is what I find to be adequate for question 15. However, any new information, tips, or suggestions on this application from MDL would be helpful. Perhaps MDL could post a message to AWIPS INFO directing us to any new information when it becomes available.
88. only complaint is how slow it is to load and when I want to switch the application to a smaller window to look at something else, it's hard to get rid of the scan data window.
89. GOOD APP FOR GENERAL CONVECTION BUT SLOWS SYSTEM DOWN TOO MUCH IN SEVERE EPISODES.
90. Users manuals are written as documentation....we need users manuals written as instruction. We need task based, cookbook users manuals that state the final goal, and the steps to take. Not something that reads: this button does this, and that button does that". Tell me the proper sequence to click the buttons to achieve my goal. SCAN is a good tool, but we are right on the edge of having enough CPU memory. Sometimes the slow display of other D2D functions isn't worth using SCAN."
91. Speed is everything during severe outbreaks. I have great expectations once we convert everything to the LINUX environment. That's the only limiting issue at this time. It's great stuff and helps augment the total decision making process. Now - when will we be able to use it on WES ?????? That's where the training issues will be addressed.
92. Too many bells and whistles. It is processor hungry. We cannot afford to have to wait for critical radar data that we can analyze faster and better because SCAN is slowing down AWIPS.
93. When needed most (numerous cells), it bogs the system down.
94. SCAN provides information to late for operational use.
95. Even though I believe scan works fine...I still find myself not loading scan when convection pops up. I think one major reason for this is a then cluttered d2d screen. With all the different 4-panel screens up on D2D...sometimes there just isnt room to efficiently look at SCAN.
96. While SCAN is quite useful for monitoring potential for severe storms, it can also be quite annoying during times of severe weather with numerous alerts, alarms, and various other distracting noises. A cross section application needs to be developed and workstation slow downs need to be avoided. Hopefully this will improve with the upgrade to Linux workstations.
97. Scan is useful at the beginning of severe weather, and as a flag, but it is only the first step in monitoring severe weather. Too often in the past the software has hung up and taken valuable time away in trying to keep it going.
98. Code is too complex or bloated to run adequately on hardware in field in weather. Our first event with SCAN on, practically brought our entire awips to its knees. After a couple more similar events, we

disabled it and haven't used it since.

99. We here in DDC do not use SCAN. The few times scan was running we experienced a dramatic slow down in D2D performance. Also by waiting on SCAN's volume scan products to come in we loose up to 5 minutes in lead time.
100. Bogs down AWIPS, sometimes to the point where NCF has to get involved to reboot. During severe weather, this is dangerous. I never use it.
101. SCAN needs to run more efficiently.
102. I want to like SCAN...but in all honesty I never see anyone use it. When I have tried it...it bogs down my machines tremendously (what doesn't?) Something is always beeping, bonking, or blinking at me...and the displays clutter my screen. The tables/GUI's are very nice and well laid out...but can lead to info overload. I would use it more if it were faster and more streamlined...and less consuming".
103. This application must be on a seperate platform from AWIPS. Give the field something that works...WDSS!!!!
104. Algorithms are just that--can only help collate data...not tell you what decision to make. SCAN is better than WWA. Why? Compare the 3 features user need as described above...and why SCAN is more accepted than WWA. Though SCAN still has some issues that need resolving like more flexibility in localization/customization.
105. On the HP's it consumes too much of the system resources.
106. SCAN is sometimes useful and sometimes not. Some forecasters in the office hate it others do not mind it. Most of us use it for trend analysis of thunderstorm systems and still rely heavily on the actual radar data to determine real threat. At this time do not have any good suggestions for improving it.
107. If you rely on SCAN to tell you something people will be dead. Thats exactly why I don't use it.
108. It is still just a tool- mainly because it is a volume product. Not very useful for pulse type severe. Not sure about build 5.2.2, but in previous builds it a volume scan old.
109. So you know how to stop any computer in its tracks, no matter how powerful the processor?
Answer: Start SCAN. Stop the stupid turf wars---give us WDSS. It worked, your stuff doesn't.
110. system slows down HP systems too much. perhaps when all the HPs are swapped out to linux, the linux version of SCAN may be worth looking at. SCAN is a very poor imitation of the WDSS.
111. I would be more excited about SCAN, but HGX has a WDSS workstation that was developed before AWIPS was deployed to the field. AWIPS and the WDSS both obtain their data from the ORPG, but the WDSS is more timely in providing critical alerts during a warning situation. Most of the HGX forecasters opt not to load SCAN during severe weather, because the user interface clutters the desktop, and SCAN tends to lag far enough behind that the forecasters are already aware of the alarmed criteria. AWIPS needs to be able to perform cross sections on the fly, and get away from the time-consuming baseline configuration. The WDSS only requires two mouse clicks to generate a cross section.
112. I rarely use it, because I'm much more accustomed to using other techniques that don't require so

much graphs, tables, etc (i.e. multi-layer reflectivity and velocity scans).

113. Seldom use SCAN

114. Speed of display is slow. Results come in well after the end of the volume scan making it less useful. The most useful feature of the display right now is the ability to see time trends of reflectivity based algorithms. Scan is much better for that than the Cell Trends product. Scan will become more useful when the WS's are replaced with Linux boxes so it is faster, when the new" meso algorithm is integrated in the output, and when it can be viewed in case study or playback mode on the WES."
115. The biggest problem we had with SCAN was that it was released too soon, when only J200 workstations were available. They simply could not support a CPU intensive program like SCAN, and, as it caused workstations to hang and crash, forecasters abandoned the program as useless. We also have the legacy WDSS, which NEVER fails, and with which most forecasters are proficient. As a consequence of their first very bad experiences with SCAN, the program is used very little, although I have had pretty good luck with it on the Linux based workstations. It will just take the forecasters a while to start trusting that the program will not crash their workstations - not a pleasant experience when you are in warning mode.
116. I really don't believe that much of our staff have used SCAN during any significant weather events, and I don't recall seeing much SCAN information. The cell trends application on the PUP were much better than any of the SCAN output I have viewed.
117. Would like to know how SCAN and WDSS-II will be integrated in future builds.
118. To be honest our office doesnt use SCAN too much but it is extremely useful when the weather dictates its use. I would almost have to say that the GUI has too many options at times.
119. It is a noisy, time-consuming, irritating application that should not be used in an operational environment. It is one of the most annoying, pestering pains in the behind to be strapped upon forecasters. I do not know anyone who uses it...everyone just clears it when it activates...and for good reason. Get rid of it.
120. ONLY ONE FORECASTER HERE USES IT. SCAN IS OF NO VALUE SINCE BY THE TIME IT GIVES YOU DATA THE EVENT HAS LIKELY ALREADY OCCURRED. WE PREACH TO NOT USE IT AND INTEROGATE THE RADAR DATA TO STAY AHEAD OF EVENTS.
121. I never used SCAN, but have noticed from others that the application uses too much of the workstation resources. This slows down the system too much.
122. Very dry year and had no real chance to look at and utilize SCAN functions.
123. Haven't really used it enough to make a firm judgement. Probably best for warning in pulse storm environments.
124. Maybe I'm a throwback, but I prefer to use the base data instead of relying on SCAN. SCAN, like its predecessor WDSS, is intended to be used as a safety net". Good to maintain situational awareness, perhaps, but not sufficient to use as a primary warning decision making tool."
125. SCAN takes up too much system resources. It really slows down an AWIPS workstation when it is running. Often times, the data is one or even two volume scans behind. This needs to be addressed if the field is going to use this program operationally.

126. The screen is often too cluttered when many options are selected and I can't figure out how to reduce the clutter. I am not familiar with background algorithms so as to be able to decide whether or not to rely on them. A single indicator for the presence of severe weather should be provided. Indicator could be based on statistical analysis, such as logistic regression (and/or other appropriate multivariate statistical analysis), of all parameters that would indicate that the statistical analysis indicates that a tornado or severe weather is present.
127. For forecasters heavily reliant on radar algorithms, SCAN may be quite helpful. We do not utilize algorithm output, and produce verification scores well above the national average. The slowdown to our system that SCAN causes just does not make the application worth utilizing.
128. SCAN continues to be a big resource hog. SCAN is utilized for isolated or small severe weather outbreaks, but during critical severe weather outbreaks, SCAN is discarded because it slows the system down too much. This is a GREAT severe weather tool (and will be even more when you incorporate WDSS elements), but it needs to run more efficiently.
129. SCAN locks up frequently during severe weather.
130. SCAN data is often several Volume scans behind radar data
131. Had past problems getting SCAN to update... i.e. contain the latest information from the latest volume scan. There have been instances when SCAN gets 1-2 volume scans behind. This may be a result of running two or more versions of SCAN at the same time on different workstations. One of the versions will not update properly.
132. SCAN is OK to list the most important storms. I really do not use it much for actual warning decisions.
133. Though SCAN has been in our office for two years, it is not used routinely. It has limited use since its algorithm output tends to lag base data output. The application also tends to be a resource hog, which compromises warning efficiency and operation.
134. The fonts can be larger, or using different highlighting colors. Once the red highlighting comes on, the numbers are hard to see.
135. Having been exposed to the capabilities of WDSS (which SCAN attempts to replicate), I am thoroughly convinced that access to real-time radar data and the ability to query that data is paramount to improving our severe weather performance. From what I've seen, SCAN does replicate the GUI interfaces that mimic WDSS algorithm output, but functionalities such as easy cross sections, multiple radar data integration, and access to newer algorithms are critical missing components of the SCAN strategy. I hope to see full WDSS-II capabilities integrated into AWIPS.
136. Biggest problem with SCAN is its memory. All other applications run verrrry slow when in use.
137. Last year I did not use SCAN at all (and I was a big proponent of it at our office). I would STRONGLY encourage NWS to get WDSS-II at ALL NWS offices asap! The software capabilities of WDSS-II are far superior to what SCAN currently is. I am very familiar with SCAN-II as I am good friends of the NSSL developers of this software (heck, the darn thing runs on a laptop!!). NWS needs to spend the \$\$ to get this operational NWS-wide and just not at featured" offices (i.e., ICT)"

138. This was the ultimate in dumping an application on the field with no training, little documentation, and a huge disconnect between what the developers thought was effective and reality with the field. The fact that running SCAN slowed AWIPS to a crawl to the point of making it unusable should have been enough to prevent the fielding of SCAN in the first place.
139. slows operations system and waiting for full volume scan.
140. too slow and most times an alert radar operator can see something developing well ahead of a SCAN notification
141. Tells me what I should already know as a radar operator. Using a program which boggs the system down, for hindsight purposes, seems unnecessary to me.
142. It is such a resource hog we do not use it.
143. More negative comments. SCAN really slows the AWIPS system down and is annoying. The information is good and idea is great, but needs work on not slowing system down and updating more quickly. I worked with the NSSL WDSS test system several years ago at WFO IND. That system had a SCAN type layout that was incredible and worked great. If SCAN can evolve to that, it would be terrific!!
144. Too slow, but then again so to is most of the AWIPS system on anything but the Linux machines.
145. Needs to incorporate volume scans from adjacent radars ala WDSS2. Would like ALL of the fields from cell trends added to the table (the storm centroid height is still not available and is used heavily here, comparing it to max dbz height for hail). Very few people use SCAN here at all because of propensity to slow down the HPs.
146. SCAN is helpful but it can be a drain on AWIPS resources and sometimes too much information is presented. Default alerts are often too insignificant and have to be changed manually every time SCAN is loaded or reloaded. Updated info reaches some workstations later than others.
147. I actually like SCAN, but it does get bogged down and seems too slow at times. Having to wait for volume scan to complete can be troublesome during severe weather events.
148. I don't use it very much. To be honest, I find most of the parameters rather worthless. The one exception is the cell trend graphs.
149. Scan utilites are useful, but there needs to be a method to choose which displays, prodcuts, etc that you want to display/use. For example, I'd like to reconfigure SCAN to a Scan-lite" that doesn't have all the standard configuration. This seems nearly impossible to do without getting into the code."
150. As a warning forecaster, I do not use SCAN a lot. However, our office does find it very useful for the HMT or support MET to view SCAN data and see if we are missing something. So I think SCAN is a great safety net.
151. We have access to WDDS software, so we do not utilize SCAN software very much due to the load on the system.
152. We have SCAN installed and configured, but do not need it operationally. 99.9% of our warnings in the WFO Junuea AOR are long fused. I did use SCAN briefly at the WFO Salt Lake City and found it

very useful during convective events.

153. It seems to take a lot of processing time.
154. No training has been provided on SCAN.
155. SCAN was a resource hog in the beginning and it seemed to function way behind the power curve (like 5-10 minutes slow). So it never really seemed to fill a niche we needed in operations.
156. Don't use it much. Little severe wx here.
157. I prefer not to use it during severe weather.
158. Scan alarm goes off for no discernable reason at times at AJK. Perhaps its not set up right in LKN, because it pegs large hail and potential distruction when those things are not going on. It also has a strident reaction to chaff, which is probably okay because it gives us a heads up to make sure its chaff and not a huge cell.
159. SCAN should be used as a safety net, but many forecasters rely on it as a primary tool. I have seen this fail time and again. Relying on this can be a crutch and must be used as a net only. There are also paramters within SCAN that are consistantly wrong or misleading. An example of this is the method of calculating CAPE and VIL.
160. Updates are too slow. I get my information by evalutating the radar data as it comes in...not waiting for a slow loading table to tell me if I need to warn.
161. Would like to configure the lower threshold for determining a cell, as the current level goes off too often with no need.
162. I always use SCAN when there is the possibility of severe convective storms. It is an excellent manager of thunderstorm activity. I like having a list of thunderstorm intensity parameters and I especially like the cell trends feature. I also like being able to adapt parameter thresholds to fit different severe weather environments. SCAN provides me with the flexibility I need to adequately manage both severe and non-severe convective storms.
163. SCAN is difficult to use because it takes awhile to start up, and slows down processes on D2D. It is a cumbersome program so I rarely use it. There are too many parameters in the table, so it's hard to glance at it quickly during a warning situation. I know the parameters are configurable, but this requires too much time in a severe weather situation.
164. Resource hog that makes it nearly impossible to use operationally.
165. I have never seen SCAN
166. I found it to be useful at times. If it could work faster and not slow down the system so much, it would have potential.
167. First SCAN will really slow down your workstation. All of the bells and Whistles" are very annoying. I you relied soley on SCAN to issue warnings, you would over warn bigtime!! Both offices I've been at actually turn SCAN off because nobody has a use for it. I could see where maybe someone who does not feel comfortable using all radar products might find it useful. But during an active event, it's just a

wait of time to keep it running."

168. Unfortunately when SCAN was first installed, it was slow to respond to the available radar data. It still has this reputation, although I think it is faster than before. But because of its reputation of being slow, SCAN has largely been ignored by our forecasters.
169. Sometimes it's too slow, often when you need it most.
170. It really has potential but is just not very good software. You need to work with offices more to find out how to streamline this application. It has promise but is often more of a distraction.
171. It really has potential but is just not very good software. You need to work with offices more to find out how to streamline this application. It has promise but is often more of a distraction.
172. This is a great application!!
173. SCAN has been a problem with our DS server, and having less than 50% of the FA with radar coverage it doesn't look to be an application that we would use very much at AFC.
174. Great to look at trend data.
175. It's an excellent program with lots of great information. My favorite use is the trend graphs, to see if a storm is increasing or decreasing its VIL, echo top, etc.
176. SCAN is satisfactory, but not great. From time to time, SCAN is not sufficiently up-to-date. In other words, it seems to get bogged down when the system is very busy. Also, there are only so many square inches of viewing area on the monitors. With everything else there is to look at, SCAN just simply gets squeezed out.
177. I was a Radar Focal Point for several years during SCAN implementation and never really understood where the data was coming from and what algorithms were being used. Were they 88D algorithms or were they TDL algorithms? If they are not 88D, then I wouldn't trust them since they haven't been tested and are not what the forecasters are used to. SCAN was normally slow so it didn't get used much. I'm sure it runs much better on Linux.
178. SCAN is useful from the onset of convection, but runs a little slow for fast paced severe weather.
179. SCAN's initial builds were buggy, which significantly lowered confidence in the program. This lowered confidence is a difficult thing to overcome. When dealing with a program that must function in the most stressful of WFO environments (i.e. warning situations), one can not be wondering/worrying about the application failing.
180. too many false alarms so you tend to ignore the pop up display.
181. All in all SCAN works well. The only issues I have with it is the amount of resources it uses on the HP workstations and the fact that SCAN will not update on the LINUX boxes after about 20 minutes and needs to be restarted every so often.

182. I like using it because it gives me confidence that I'm not overlooking something. I really like the clickable trends. We don't get much convective activity up here, but when we do, SCAN helps. Some find the frequent alerts annoying. I think there could be more guidance on configuring the alerts and such. I don't think we've done anything there in that respect. Our radar focal point was not very Awips admin-oriented.
183. Don't use it. Hardware cannot handle it.
184. The biggest problem is the configuration and the screen space it takes up. I would like to bring up only a few of the items that are displayed in the SCAN suite. The only way to do this is to load everything and then remove stuff. I like the cells with their speed displayed, but most of the other graphics are not needed. The table is okay, but it takes up room. (I know this can not be addressed, but maybe we have it show up only if I click on a button.)
185. In order for SCAN to be useful, it needs to be on the Linux Boxes. It is currently too slow on the HP's.
186. We do not use SCAN at our offices because it slows down our system during severe weather operations.
187. Slows Awips down. Can find information better with other tools. Too many alerts get in the way during severe weather. Extra mouse clicks is annoying as well as alarms. If Scan ran on a separate PC and updated automatically, it would be more helpful.
188. At times appears to draw upon other AWIPS applications slowing them down.
189. The reason we do not use scan, is because it is a resource hog on the HP workstations.
190. Bogs down AWIPS to the point that it's best not to use it.
191. THE TRAINING RECEIVED FOR SCAN WAS A WHILE BACK. AT THAT POINT SCAN WAS NOT EASILY USED DUE TO WORKSTATION AND CPU FACTORS AND I HAVE NOT USED IT VERY OFTEN. SCAN HAS A LOT OF COLORS AND ALARMS BUT IF YOU DO NOT TAKE THE TIME TO CONFIGURE IT, IT COULD BE MORE OF A DISTRACTION.
192. I find SCAN useful as a way to perform meteorological triage during particularly active convective episodes. I would be nice to be able to access my preferences a little more quickly.
193. Don't know enough about the program to use it.
194. Uses way too much system resources, counterproductive. Data provided not worth the sacrifice of system response. Leads users away from looking at radar base data.
195. used it effectively at my old office (ILX) but new office (ICT) HP workstation hardware is old and slow....so SCAN cannot be used.
196. Forecasters won't use SCAN for two reasons: It alerts for way too many things that are unimportant and it uses up way too much computer resources.

197. Though probably biased, SCAN was introduced to our office and basically made the operational AWIPS workstations unuseable. When scan was on screen, it might take 30 seconds for a screen to switch or refresh. Therefore, training and use has been very limited. Maybe its a training issue. I will say its got lots of bells, whistles and tables. My question is How much difference does all that really make?" A few minutes possibly but what about system performance. I don't know of anybody on staff who uses the program operationally due to the system constraints. "
198. It seemed to slow down our D2Ds too much to be very useful in a severe weather situation.
199. SCAN seems to be one of those applications that allows forecasters to be too lax in a critical weather watch situation. By the time SCAN software detects a significant storm and/or feature, it is probably too late to warn effectively.
200. We use SCAN as a watch our back" safety net in severe weather, rather than a primary tool. The biggest disadvantage is the slowness...more than one volume scan behind the radar. I realize that much of this is inherent to how SCAN has to function, since it needs to wait for the volume products from the radar. Our office deals with a lot of severe weather, with radar operators that are well trained and rely heavily on base data as it comes straight from the radar. If we waited for SCAN to indicate severe weather, we would miss lots of precious lead time on our warnings. We run SCAN during severe weather on a linux box sitting next to an AWIPS workstation. It doesn't take up real-estate on the main warning workstation(s), and runs in the "background". I can see where SCAN could be helpful for inexperienced radar operators and as a safety net to catch some things that forecasters may miss, but I don't see it being a primary warning tool...it's just too slow compared to base data straight from the radar. Although we have not had any new forecasters or interns in our office in quite a while, I see SCAN as a good training tool to help a new radar operator pick out what he/she should be looking for. For question 17 above...AWIPSInfo has gotten so full of traffic, it is difficult for us to sort the important info from the many postings from other offices' local troubles. Several times I have seen extremely important posts from headquarters,etc. buried in the middle of tons of useless traffic. Many times I just delete all the AWIPSInfo messages because I just don't have time. The AWIPS focal point does the same. We have missed a couple messages that were important because of this. There needs to be a beeter way to get important info out to the field without making us sort through so much traffic to find it! "
201. SCAN has too many alarms which results in unnecessary distractions in the warning environment. Radar operators should be devoting their time to analyzing the base reflectivity and velocity data (with some help from the algorithm output) and not on data from SCAN which can be two or more volume scans behind.
202. I have not used SCAN sufficiently to provide valuable input. I would rather have base data quickly and efficiently than have SCAN running.
203. I received teletraining on SCAN several years ago, but I have never used it and cannot offer any opinion at this time. I guess I don't understand what it does for me that the existing 88D information does not already provide. I look at the base radar data for each elevation slice when making radar decisions, and do not rely much on algorithms, symbols and bells.
204. Our weather has been somewhat benign with convection that I have not had a really good opportunity to use all of its functions.